



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE **MN**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,964	09/12/2003	Vijay V. Sarashetti	14249-009001	1087
22879 7590 07/24/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER VO, TRUONG V	
			ART UNIT 2109	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,964

Applicant(s)

SARASHETTI, VIJAY V.

Examiner

Truong V. Vo

Art Unit

2109

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to application 10/662,964 filed on September 12, 2003 in which claims 1 to 26 are presented for examination.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1 to 26 are pending, of which claims 1, 9, 17, 21 and 24 are in independent form. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claims 9-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not statutory for the following reasons:

A computer readable medium having instructions thereon which when executed perform the steps of: "a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for representing records, the computer program product being operable to cause a machine to:" would normally be considered statutory unless the specification defines "computer readable medium" as including intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shorter (US Patent Number 5,946,681) in view of Altschuler et al. (US Patent Number 6,330,554 B1). Hereinafter referred to as Altschuler.

7. **In considering claim 1**, Shorter discloses a "method for representing records" as a high level flowcharts in FIG. 6A-6D for a process of resolving an object identifier from object attributes and/or modification of an object attribute record (column 2 lines 49-53), "...assigning a unique identifier to a record stored at a record collection site" as a person first becomes a customer or subscriber, an object is created to store information about that person, the information is entered, the object is assigned a unique identifier, and the object is written to the database accessible to the host data processing system [record collection site]. The attributes or properties of the newly created object reflect information about the person, and certain attributes are extracted to create an object attribute record. The attributes extracted are those which will permit, alone or in combination, accurate identification of the object and the corresponding

Art Unit: 2109

unique object identifier (column 6 lines 19-30). However, Shorter did not specifically mention hierarchical tree structure.

Meanwhile, Altschuler discloses an object usage log 322 may include records 324 having a user ID field 325 (optional), an object ID field 326, a time/date stamp field 327, and a session ID field 328 (optional). This is very similar to Shorter invention because the object ID field 326 is a unique identifier in Shorter invention. Altschuler also discloses a unique identifier referred to as an "object ID" (column 14 line 25).

Furthermore Altschuler discloses, "entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure" as a tabular, graph, or hierarchical (e.g., tree) structures can all be mapped to a graph (column 20 lines 50-51). Referring to FIG. 3A is a hierarchical tree structure and the object ID is unique identifier therefore is entering into the hierarchical tree. "Sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site" as a structured objects of a hierarchy of an Internet web site, or a linear objects of an order of web sites visited by a user. Recall that each of the stored objects 312 [the hierarchical tree structure already stored in the store objects 312 which store at storage device 212] should have an unique identifier, also referred to as an "object ID" (column 14 lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Shorter invention with Altschuler to including a hierarchical tree structure. The motivation to combine is apparent in the Shorter reference, because a hierarchical tree structure would organize the record for faster retrieval.

8. **In considering claim 2**, Shorter discloses "using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report." The examiner is reading this as, suppose that the objects of interest identify a person who is a bank customer or a health care plan subscriber.

When the person first becomes a customer or subscriber, an object is created to store

information [report synonym is information] about that person, the information is

entered, the object is assigned a unique identifier (column 6 lines 19-23). "Sending the

aggregate report to the central storage site" as object is written to the database [central

storage site] accessible to the host data processing system (column 6 lines 24-25).

9. **In considering claim 3**, Shorter discloses "using the unique identifier at the

central storage site to access the record stored at the record collection site" the

examiner is reading this as, assigned a unique identifier, and the object is written to the

database accessible to the host data processing [host data processing read as

collection site] system (column 6 lines 23-25).

10. **In considering claim 4**, Altschuler discloses "unique identifier includes

information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure." The examiner

is reading FIG. 3A of Altschuler to be similar to FIG. 3 of the examine application.

Therefore, the information representing a node would be Time Stamp, Session ID etc.

and FIG. 3A is a hierarchical tree structure. The motivation to combine is the same as in

claim 1. See claim 1 above for details.

11. In considering claim 5, Altaschuler discloses "the node is located in a higher position of the hierarchical tree structure than the unique identifier." Referring to FIG. 3A of Altaschuler clearly show a node is represented by the User ID and the user ID is first in line than come the Object ID [unique identifier]. The motivation to combine is the same as in claim 1. See claim 1 above for details.

12. In considering claim 6, Shorter discloses "the unique identifier to produce the aggregate report includes counting the unique identifier with a second unique identifier assigned to a second record stored at the record collection site." Referring to FIG. 3 the data processing system which reads as record collection site is producing information [report] by the Object ID [unique identifier] combine system A and system B.

13. In considering claim 7, Shorter discloses "a unique identifier to produce an aggregate report includes summing data included in the record accessed by the unique identifier with data included in a second record accessed by a second unique identifier." The examiner is reading this as, the object resolution services 302 and 304 are connected by and may communicate via a communications link 306 (column 4 lines 9-11).

14. In considering claim 8, Altaschuler discloses "a unique key that includes information representing a second node in the hierarchical tree structure is assigned to the node." The examiner is reading this as, a "primary key" 630a/630b is a unique

identifier for the relation. Basically, the primary key may be one or more attributes for which no two (2) tuples (or records) have the same value (column 17 lines 39-42). The motivation to combine is the same as in claim 1. See claim 1 above for details.

15. **In considering claim 9**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 applied to claim 9.

16. **In considering claim 10**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 2. Therefore, the rejection of claim 2 applied to claim 10.

17. **In considering claim 11**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 3. Therefore, the rejection of claim 3 applied to claim 11.

18. **In considering claim 12**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 4. Therefore, the rejection of claim 4 applied to claim 12.

19. **In considering claim 13**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 5. Therefore, the rejection of claim 5 applied to claim 13.

20. **In considering claim 14**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 6. Therefore, the rejection of claim 6 applied to claim 14.

21. **In considering claim 15**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 7. Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 applied to claim 15.

22. **In considering claim 16**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 8. Therefore, the rejection of claim 8 applied to claim 16.

23. **In considering claim 17**, Shorter discloses "a unique identifier assigned to a record stored at the record collection site." The examiner is reading this as, a person first becomes a customer or subscriber, an object is created to store information about that person, the information is entered, the object is assigned a unique identifier, and the object is written to the database accessible to the host data processing system [record collection site]. The attributes or properties of the newly created object reflect

Art Unit: 2109

information about the person, and certain attributes are extracted to create an object attribute record. The attributes extracted are those which will permit, alone or in combination, accurate identification of the object and the corresponding unique object identifier (column 6 lines 19-30). However, Shorter did not specifically mention hierarchical tree structure.

Meanwhile, Altschuler discloses an object usage log 322 may include records 324 having a user ID field 325 (optional), an object ID field 326, a time/date stamp field 327, and a session ID field 328 (optional). This is very similar to Shorter invention because the object ID field 326 is a unique identifier in Shorter invention. Altschuler also discloses a unique identifier referred to as an "object ID" (column 14 line 25).

Furthermore Altschuler discloses, "receiving a hierarchical tree structure at a central storage site from a record collection site, the hierarchical tree structure includes" as a tabular, graph, or hierarchical (e.g., tree) structures can all be mapped to a graph (column 20 lines 50-51). Referring to FIG. 3A is a hierarchical tree structure and the object ID is unique identifier therefore is entering into the hierarchical tree. The structured objects of a hierarchy of an Internet web site, or a linear objects of an order of web sites visited by a user. Recall that each of the stored objects 312 [the hierarchical tree structure already stored in the store objects 312 which store at storage device 212] should have an unique identifier, also referred to as an "object ID" (column 14 lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Shorter invention with Altschuler to including a

Art Unit: 2109

hierarchical tree structure. The motivation to combine is apparent in the Shorter reference, because a hierarchical tree structure would organize the record for faster retrieval.

24. In considering claim 18, Shorter discloses "using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site." The examiner is reading this as, the object is assigned a unique identifier, and the object is written to the database accessible to the host data processing system (column 6 lines 23-25).

25. In considering claim 19, Shorter discloses "receiving an aggregate report at the central storage site produced at the record collection site using the unique identifier." The examiner is reading this as, an object attribute record may contain, for example, the person's last name, first name, middle initial, social security number, home address, gender, race, driver's license number and state, date of birth, etc. The unique object identifier for the object is contained within the object attribute record in association with these attributes. If access to the object is required but the object identifier is not known, the attributes in the object attribute record may be utilized to determine the object identifier so that the object may be retrieved from the database (column 6 lines 31-40).

26. In considering claim 20, Altschuler discloses "unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure." The examiner is reading FIG. 3A of Altschuler to be similar to FIG. 3 of the examine application.

Art Unit: 2109

Therefore, the information representing a node would be Time Stamp, Session ID etc.

and FIG. 3A is a hierarchical tree structure. The motivation to combine is the same as in claim 1. See claim 1 above for details.

27. **In considering claim 21**, most of the limitations of this claim have been met in the rejection of claim 1. See claim 1 for details. Furthermore, Shorter discloses "using the unique identifier at the central storage site to access the record stored at the record collection site" the examiner is reading this as, assigned a unique identifier, and the object is written to the database accessible to the host data processing [host data processing read as collection site] system (column 6 lines 23-25).

28. **In considering claim 22**, Shorter discloses "unique identifier at the record collection site is used to produce an aggregate report." The examiner is reading this as, suppose that the objects of interest identify a person who is a bank customer or a health care plan subscriber. When the person first becomes a customer or subscriber, an object is created to store information [report synonym is information] about that person, the information is entered, the object is assigned a unique identifier (column 6 lines 19-23). "Sending the aggregate report to the central storage site" as object is written to the database [central storage site] accessible to the host data processing system (column 6 lines 24-25).

29. **In considering claim 23**, Altschuler discloses "unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure." The examiner is reading FIG. 3A of Altschuler to be similar to FIG. 3 of the examine application. Therefore, the information representing a node would be Time Stamp, Session ID etc. and FIG. 3A is a hierarchical tree structure. The motivation to combine is the same as in claim 1. See claim 1 above for details.

30. **In considering claim 24**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a system for performing a method discloses in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 applied to claim 24.

31. **In considering claim 25**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a system for performing a method discloses in claim 2. Therefore, the rejection of claim 2 applied to claim 25.

32. **In considering claim 26**, the combination of Shorter and Altschuler clearly show a computer program product for performing a method discloses in claim 4. Therefore, the rejection of claim 4 applied to claim 26.

Conclusion

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2109

- a) Greer et al. US 2004/0117361 A1 published June 17, 2004 discloses a system and method for managing construction projects.
- b) Sutter Patent Number 5,924,094 published July 13, 1999 discloses a independent distributed database system.
- c) Hoffman et al. Patent Number 7,120,596 B2 published October 10, 2006 discloses a system, method and computer program product for landed cost reporting in a supply chain management framework.

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truong V. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 270-1982. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thr. 7:30a.m.-5p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on (571) 272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2109

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Truong Van Vo
T.V./t.v.


July 15, 2007


FRANTZ COBY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER